

## **EXHIBIT 18**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE MATTER OF )  
 ) 00-CV-4471  
 )  
ARMSTRONG WORLD INDUSTRIES, ) Philadelphia, PA  
 ) May 23, 2006  
 ) 9:27 a.m.  
 )

TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDUARDO C. ROBRENO  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Debtors: STEPHEN KAROTKIN, ESQUIRE  
DEBRA A. DANDENEAU, ESQUIRE  
Weil, Gotshal & Manges  
767 Fifth Avenue  
10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10153

For Unsecured Creditors Committee: STEPHEN J. SHIMSHAK, ESQUIRE  
Paul, Weiss, Rifkind,  
Wharton & Garrison, LLP  
1285 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10019

For the Creditors: ELIHU INSELBUCH, ESQUIRE  
NATHAN D. FINCH, ESQUIRE  
Caplin & Drysdale Chartered  
375 Park Avenue  
35<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10152

For Dean Trifolet: JANE W. PARVER, ESQUIRE  
Kaye Scholer, LLP  
425 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10022

Audio Operator: JOSEPH MATKOWSKI  
Transcribed by: DIANA DOMAN TRANSCRIBING  
P. O. Box 129  
Gibbsboro, New Jersey 08026  
Off: (856) 435-7172  
Fax: (856) 435-7124  
E-mail: [dianadoman@comcast.net](mailto:dianadoman@comcast.net)

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript  
produced by transcription service.

I N D E X

WITNESSES                      DIRECT      CROSS      REDIRECT      RECROSS

FOR THE CREDITORS:

Daniel Myer	21 (Fin)	61	96	99
Edward Houff	101	137		

EXHIBITS:

Iden.                      Evid.

19	Mr. Myer's C.V.		21
20	CCR Settlement Agreements		21
21	CCR Settlement Agreements		21
22	CCR Settlement Agreements		21
23	CCR Settlement Agreements		21
24	CCR Settlement Agreements		21
28	Plan Supporter's Agreement		102
29	Plan Supporter's Agreement		110
30	Logo		111
31	Document 9/26/80	118	
37	Opening Statement		122
75	Dyson Opinion		124
33	Plan Supporter's Agreement		113
34	Plan Supporter's Agreement		113
36	Plan Supporter's Agreement		114
32	Rebranding Agreement		115

OPENING:

By: Mr. Inselbuch	6
By: Mr. Shimshak	12

1 the witness and other counsel that have the exhibits just to be  
2 used with this witness. If you would prefer to use the exhibit  
3 set you already have up there, it's up to you. But, I have  
4 collected in a notebook just the exhibits I'm going to use with  
5 Mr. Myer. They're identical to the ones in your book.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Well, that will be fine. This  
7 will be easier to handle. Thank you. Okay. Let's proceed.  
8 We'll use the courtroom clock here, which is 9:53. And, we'll  
9 begin now. Swear the witness, please, when you have a chance,  
10 Mr. Matkowski.

11 DANIEL MYER, CREDITORS' WITNESS, SWORN

12 CLERK: Please state your full name.

13 MR. MYER: Daniel Myer, M-Y-E-R.

14 DIRECT EXAMINATION

15 BY MR. FINCH:

16 Q Nathan Finch for the Asbestos Claimants Committee. Mr.  
17 Myer, could you turn in your exhibit binder to Exhibit 19?

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q Does it accurately reflect your work and educational  
20 history?

21 A Yes, sir.

22 MR. FINCH: Your Honor, we offer at this time Exhibit  
23 19, and also 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, as to which I understand  
24 there's no objection.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Admitted without objection, is

1 that right?

2 MR. GORDON: No objection.

3 THE COURT: Okay.

4 BY MR. FINCH:

5 Q Could you briefly describe your background in asbestos  
6 litigation, what you've done, who your clients have been?

7 A Well, I started back in 1982 with regards to managing --  
8 handling asbestos related personal injury claims. At that  
9 time, I was with Continental Insurance Company. In 1986, I  
10 believe it was, I went to work in the capacity as a supervisor  
11 in the claims department for the Asbestos Claim Facility. In  
12 that capacity, I was involved with middle management  
13 responsibilities for the evaluation, disposition, settlement of  
14 cases on behalf of a number of different asbestos defendants  
15 who were members of the Asbestos Claim Facility. I continued  
16 in that position until 1988.

17 With the demise of the asbestos claim facility and  
18 the creation of the Center for Claims Resolution, at which  
19 point I was asked to stay aboard and become -- became the  
20 director of claims for the Center for Claims Resolution. At  
21 the CCR, I was responsible for the overall management of  
22 asbestos claims, personal injury claims on behalf of  
23 approximately 20 different defendants for about 36 different  
24 jurisdictions across the country.

25 Q And, what -- would that include basically the entire

1 eastern part of the United States to the Mississippi River?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q You -- have you -- as part of your work, have you observed  
4 trials of personal injury cases?

5 A Oh, yes, sir.

6 Q How many cases have you settled or overseen the resolution  
7 of in your career in asbestos?

8 A I would estimate somewhere between 4 to -- 4 to 500,000  
9 cases.

10 Q When you were with the CCR, Armstrong was one of the  
11 members?

12 A Yes, sir.

13 Q And, did you attend settlement conferences on a regular  
14 basis?

15 A All the time.

16 Q Could you describe for the Court who would be the parties  
17 present at such settlement conferences?

18 A The parties would typically include defendant  
19 representatives, plaintiff counsel, special masters, mediators,  
20 arbitrators, Judges. Those parties would be involved in  
21 settlement conferences typically.

22 Q After the CCR fell apart in early -- in January of 2001,  
23 could you describe what you did then?

24 A Yes, sir. I -- after the CCR dissolved, I started up my  
25 own company with three other partners. It's -- the name of the

1 company is called CMC, Claims Management Services. And, we  
2 provide essentially the same service that we provided in the  
3 CCR. That is to provide claim management, claims  
4 administration on behalf of a number of different defendants  
5 still involved actively in the tort system in the asbestos  
6 personal injury litigation.

7 Q Did you settle cases for any former members of the CCR  
8 after January of 2001?

9 A Yes, sir.

10 Q Would that include United States Gypsum?

11 A Yes, sir.

12 Q And, Union Carbide?

13 A Yes, sir.

14 Q And, you continue to represent Union Carbide today?

15 A Yes, sir, I do.

16 Q You mentioned in your deposition something called the  
17 total gross value of a case.

18 A Yes, sir.

19 Q Could you describe for the Court what that is and how you  
20 -- how you use it in your day to day settlement discussions?

21 A Sure. The total gross value of a case is what would  
22 typically be referred to as the total amount of the settlement  
23 that all defendants collectively have put together for purposes  
24 of resolving a claim or a case. My responsibility insofar as  
25 resolving cases on behalf of the defendants that I represent is



1 to ensure that whatever amount that I'm paying on behalf -- on  
2 their behalf reflects their relative liability and, in turn,  
3 from a dollar standpoint, their relative dollar amount of that  
4 total gross value.

5 Q And, is that something you use every day in negotiations?

6 A Sure, yes.

7 Q Could you describe to the Court what is the total gross  
8 value of a mesothelioma case in the 1999 to 2000 time frame?

9 MR. KRAVITZ: Your Honor, I'd like to object. I  
10 don't think a proper foundation has been laid for his knowledge  
11 of what the total gross value is, other than defendants are not  
12 in the CCR. I haven't heard that foundation laid yet.

13 MR. FINCH: Your Honor, I think I established a  
14 foundation. He discusses --

15 BY MR. FINCH:

16 Q Do you know the total gross value -- do you have an  
17 understanding of the total gross value of the case?

18 A Yes, I believe I do.

19 Q And, that is based on your discussions with other  
20 defendants?

21 A Well, I've interacted over the course of the last 20 years  
22 with virtually every plaintiff counsel in the country and every  
23 significant plaintiff lawyer in the country who's involved in  
24 the asbestos litigation. I've interacted with numerous co-  
25 defendants -- asbestos defendants in the context of managing

1 this litigation on behalf of, over the course of time,  
2 approximately 40 to 50 different defendants. So, in that  
3 respect, I think I -- that's where I base the knowledge of that  
4 -- that factor.

5 Q And, would it also include discussions with Magistrates  
6 and Judges and arb -- and mediators in settlement --

7 A Yes, sir.

8 Q -- conversations?

9 MR. FINCH: Your Honor, I think it is a proper  
10 foundation.

11 THE COURT: Overruled.

12 BY MR. FINCH:

13 Q Could you -- what is your understanding of the total gross  
14 value of a mesothelioma case in 1999 or 2000?

15 A In that time frame, the estimated total gross value of a  
16 mesothelioma case was between 2 and a half to 3 and a half  
17 million dollars.

18 Q And, today, in 2006, what is the total gross value of a  
19 mesothelioma case?

20 A I believe the total gross value of a mesothelioma case  
21 today is somewhere in the range of between 5 to \$8M.

22 Q You heard Mr. Shimshak describe all these elements of tort  
23 reform that have occurred. Have -- what, if any, impact has  
24 that had on the total gross value of a mesothelioma case?

25 A Very little.

1 Q It's gone up two or three times, right?

2 A Yes, sir.

3 Q In your work for the Center for Claims Resolution, did you  
4 come to an understanding as to the primary bases for  
5 Armstrong's asbestos liability?

6 A Yes, sir.

7 Q Could you describe to the Court what that is?

8 A The basis of their liability in the asbestos personal  
9 injury litigation was their involvement in the overall  
10 insulation contracting business.

11 Q And, could you describe what is the insulation contracting  
12 business? What do you mean by that?

13 A They were involved in installing asbestos products,  
14 primarily pipe and block insulation, asbestos containing  
15 cements, those types of products over the course of a number of  
16 years.

17 Q Installing other people's products in other words?

18 A Rebranded products, that's correct.

19 Q Kaylo, for example -- Owens Corning Kaylo?

20 A Kaylo, sure.

21 Q Did you come to an understanding of the geographic scope  
22 and size of Armstrong's asbestos insulation contracting  
23 business?

24 A I think most people, including myself, would have  
25 considered Armstrong to be a national defendant. In other